

**REMARKS**

This Application has been reviewed carefully in light of the Office Action mailed March 15, 2004 (“*Office Action*”). Claims 13-38 were pending in the Application and stand rejected. Applicant amends Claims 13, 15, 20, 22, 28, 30, 31, 33, and 38 to more clearly recite the original intent of these Claims and not in response to any reference cited by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration favorable action in this case.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

The Examiner rejects Claims 13-38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of references. To establish obviousness of a claimed invention under §103, all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. M.P.E.P. §2143.03. Furthermore, the Examiner must show some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine or modify the references either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. M.P.E.P. § 2143.01. Using the inventor’s disclosure as a blueprint for piecing together references without showing evidence of a suggestion, teaching, or motivation to combine the references is the essence of improper hindsight analysis.<sup>1</sup>

**Claims 13-15, 19-22, 28-33, and 37**

The Examiner rejects Claims 13-15, 19-22, 28-33, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,389,024, which issued to Ghai, et al. (“*Ghai*”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,256,293, which issued to Gerstel, et al. (“*Gerstel*”), and U.S. Patent 5,721,819, which issued to Galles, et al. (“*Galles*”).

---

<sup>1</sup> In *In re Dembiczak*, 175 F.3d 994 (Fed. Cir. 1999), the Federal Circuit reversed a finding of obviousness by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, explaining that evidence of a suggestion, teaching, or motivation to combine is essential to avoid impermissible hindsight reconstruction of an applicant’s invention:

Our case law makes clear that the best defense against the subtle but powerful attraction of a hindsight-based obviousness analysis is *rigorous application of the requirement for a showing of the teaching or motivation to combine prior art references*. Combining prior art references without evidence of such a suggestion, teaching, or motivation simply takes the inventor’s disclosure as a blueprint for piecing together the prior art to defeat patentability—the essence of hindsight.

*Id.* at 999 (emphasis added) (citations omitted).

Applicant's independent Claim 13, as amended, recites:

A method for associating routing parameters for a switch with line cards serviced by the switch, comprising:

programming a redirection memory to associate a routing parameter set in a routing memory for a switch with a first line card, the routing parameter set including a plurality of routing parameters to be provided to the switch to service the first line card; and

in response to an event initiating activation of a second line card in place of the first line card, reprogramming the redirection memory to associate the routing parameter set in the routing memory with the second line card, the routing parameters to be provided to the switch to service the second line card.

Applicant respectfully submits that *Ghai*, *Gerstel*, and *Galles*, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest every element of this Claim.

Among other aspects of Claim 13, the *Ghai-Gerstel-Galles* combination fails to teach or suggest:

in response to an event initiating activation of a second line card in place of the first line card, reprogramming the redirection memory to associate the routing parameter set in the routing memory with the second line card, the routing parameters to be provided to the switch to service the second line card.

The Examiner admits that *Ghai* fails to teach the recited element. *Office Action*, page 3. However, the Examiner attempts to combine aspects of *Gerstel* and *Galles* to produce the recited element. The Examiner states that *Gerstel* “teaches an event initiating activation of a second line card in place of the first line card.” *Office Action*, page 3. However, *Gerstel* proposes hardwiring various ports of different line cards together to solve the problem of failed line cards. *Gerstel*, Col. 3, lines 4-42. Hardwiring ports of different line cards together to solve the problem of failed line cards fails to teach or suggest “in response to an event initiating activation of a second line card in place of the first line card, reprogramming the redirection memory to associate the routing parameter set in the routing memory with the second line card, the routing parameters to be provided to the switch to service the second line card.” Furthermore, the Examiner states that *Galles* “teaches reprogramming or reconfiguring of a router table in response to a fault occurring in the network.” *Office Action*, page 3. However, *Galles* teaches determining “new routes” and “alternative paths” around

faults between nodes on a network. *Galles*, Col. 11, lines 55-65; Col. 21, line 64-Col. 22, line 6. Determining new routes and alternative paths around faults between nodes on a network fails to teach or suggest “in response to an event initiating activation of a second line card in place of the first line card, reprogramming the redirection memory to associate the routing parameter set in the routing memory with the second line card, the routing parameters to be provided to the switch to service the second line card.”

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine or modify *Ghai*, *Gerstel*, and *Galles* either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has improperly used the inventor’s disclosure as a blueprint for piecing together the references, the essence of hindsight reconstruction.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claim 13. For reasons analogous to those discussed above with regard to Claim 13, Applicant also respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claims 20, 28, and 31.

Claims 14, 15, and 19 depend from Claim 13; Claims 21 and 22 depend from Claim 20; Claims 29 and 30 depend from Claim 28; and Claims 32, 33, and 37 depend from Claim 31. Thus, because they depend from independent Claims shown above to be allowable over *Ghai* in view of *Gerstel* and *Galles*, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claims 14, 15, 19, 21, 22, 29, 30, 32, 33, and 37.

#### **Claims 16, 23, and 34**

The Examiner rejects Claims 16, 23, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ghai*, *Gerstel*, and *Galles*, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,598,409, which issued to Madonna, et al. (“*Madonna*”). Claims 16, 23, and 34 depend from Claims 13, 20, and 31 respectively, which are shown above to be allowable over *Ghai* in view of *Gerstel* and *Galles*. The introduction of *Madonna* fails to provide the elements of Applicant’s Claims 13, 20, and 31 not shown by *Ghai* in view of *Gerstel* and *Galles*.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine or modify *Ghai*, *Gerstel*, *Galles*, and *Madonna* either in the references

themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has improperly used the inventor's disclosure as a blueprint for piecing together the references, the essence of hindsight reconstruction.

Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claims 16, 23, and 34.

**Claims 17-18, 24-25, and 35-36**

The Examiner rejects Claims 17-18, 24-25, and 35-36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ghai*, *Gerstel*, *Galles*, and *Madonna*, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,147,988, which issued to Bartholomew, et al. ("*Bartholomew*"). Claims 17-18, 24-25, and 35-36 depend from Claims 13, 20, and 31 respectively, which are shown above to be allowable over *Ghai* in view of *Gerstel* and *Galles*. The introduction of *Madonna* and *Bartholomew* fails to provide the elements of Applicant's Claims 13, 20, and 31 not shown by *Ghai* in view of *Gerstel* and *Galles*.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine or modify *Ghai*, *Gerstel*, *Galles*, *Madonna*, and *Bartholomew* either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has improperly used the inventor's disclosure as a blueprint for piecing together the references, the essence of hindsight reconstruction.

Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claims 17-18, 24-25, and 35-36.

**Claim 26**

The Examiner rejects independent Claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ghai* in view of *Galles*, *Madonna*, and *Bartholomew*. Applicant's independent Claim 26 recites:

A synchronous switch for a telecommunications node,  
comprising:  
a time slot interchanger (TSI) operable to switch traffic  
between time slots for a plurality of line cards;

an instruction memory for the TSI, the instruction memory comprising a plurality of instruction sets, each instruction set including a plurality of instructions operable to be provided to the TSI to switch time slots of an associated line card;

a redirection memory operable to selectively associate each instruction set of the instruction memory with a disparate one of the line cards; and

a controller operable to reprogram the redirection memory to change associations of the instruction sets with the line cards.

Applicant respectfully submits that *Ghai*, *Galles*, *Madonna*, and *Bartholomew*, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest every element of this Claim.

Among other aspects of Claim 26, the *Ghai-Galles-Madonna-Bartholomew* combination fails to teach or suggest “a controller operable to reprogram the redirection memory to change associations of the instruction sets with the line cards.” As teaching this element, the Examiner cites discussion in *Galles* regarding determining “new routes” and “alternative paths” around faults between nodes on a network. *Galles*, Col. 11, lines 55-65; Col. 21, line 64-Col. 22, line 6. However, determining new routes and alternative paths around faults between nodes on a network simply fails to teach or suggest “a controller operable to reprogram the redirection memory to change associations of the instruction sets with the line cards.” Furthermore, *Ghai*, *Madonna*, and *Bartholomew* fail to provide this missing element.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine or modify *Ghai*, *Galles*, *Madonna*, and *Bartholomew* either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has improperly used the inventor’s disclosure as a blueprint for piecing together the references, the essence of hindsight reconstruction.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of independent Claim 26.

#### **Claim 27**

The Examiner rejects Claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ghai*, *Galles*, *Madonna* and *Bartholomew* in view of *Gerstel*. Claim 27 depends from Claim

26, which is shown above to be allowable over *Ghai* in view of *Galles*, *Madonna*, and *Bartholomew*. The introduction of *Gerstel* fails to provide the elements of Applicant's Claim 26 not shown by *Ghai* in view of *Galles*, *Madonna*, and *Bartholomew*.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine or modify *Ghai*, *Galles*, *Madonna*, *Bartholomew*, and *Gerstel* either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has improperly used the inventor's disclosure as a blueprint for piecing together the references, the essence of hindsight reconstruction.

Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claim 27.

### **Claim 38**

The Examiner rejects independent Claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ghai* in view of *Gerstel*, *Galles*, *Madonna*, and *Bartholomew*. Applicant's independent Claim 38 recites:

A method for associating routing parameters for a switch with line cards serviced by the switch, comprising:

programming a redirection memory to associate a routing parameter set in a routing memory for a switch with a first line card, the routing parameter set including a plurality of routing parameters to be provided to the switch to service the first line card;

in response to an event initiating activation of a second line card in place of the first line card, reprogramming the redirection memory to associate the routing parameter set in the routing memory with the second line card, the routing parameters to be provided to the switch to service the second line card;

programming the redirection memory to associate a second routing parameter set in the routing memory with the second line card, the second routing parameter set including a plurality of second routing parameters to be provided to the switch to service the second line card; and

in response to the event initiating activation of the second line card in place of the first line card, reprogramming the redirection memory to associate the second routing parameter set with the first line card, the second routing

parameters to be provided to the switch to service the first line card;

wherein the event is a failure of the first line card, the routing parameters comprise instructions, the routing parameter set comprises an instruction set, the routing memory comprises an instruction memory, the switch comprises a synchronous switch, the synchronous switch is a time slot interchanger (TSI), and the redirection memory comprises a programmable table storing associations between line cards serviced by the switch and the routing parameter sets in the routing memory for the switch.

Applicant respectfully submits that *Ghai*, *Gerstel*, *Galles*, *Madonna*, and *Bartholomew*, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest every element of this Claim.

Among other aspects of Claim 38, the *Ghai-Gerstel-Galles-Madonna-Bartholomew* combination fails to teach or suggest:

in response to an event initiating activation of a second line card in place of the first line card, reprogramming the redirection memory to associate the routing parameter set in the routing memory with the second line card, the routing parameters to be provided to the switch to service the second line card;

and

in response to the event initiating activation of the second line card in place of the first line card, reprogramming the redirection memory to associate the second routing parameter set with the first line card, the second routing parameters to be provided to the switch to service the first line card.

The Examiner admits that *Ghai* fails to teach the recited elements. *Office Action*, page 12. However, the Examiner attempts to combine aspects of *Gerstel* and *Galles* to produce the recited elements. The Examiner states that *Gerstel* “teaches an event initiating activation of a second line card in place of the first line card.” *Office Action*, page 12. However, *Gerstel* proposes hardwiring various ports of different line cards together to solve the problem of failed line cards. *Gerstel*, Col. 3, lines 4-42. Hardwiring ports of different line cards together to solve the problem of failed line cards fails to teach or suggest the recited elements. Furthermore, the Examiner states that *Galles* “teaches reprogramming or reconfiguring of a router table in response to a fault occurring in the network.” *Office Action*, page 13. However, *Galles* teaches determining “new routes” and “alternative paths” around faults between nodes on a network. *Galles*, Col. 11, lines 55-65; Col. 21, line 64-Col. 22, line 6.

Determining new routes and alternative paths around faults between nodes on a network fails to teach or suggest the recited claim elements. Furthermore, *Madonna* and *Bartholomew* fail to provide the recited claim elements.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine or modify *Ghai*, *Gerstel*, *Galles*, *Madonna*, and *Bartholomew* either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has improperly used the inventor's disclosure as a blueprint for piecing together the references, the essence of hindsight reconstruction.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of independent Claim 38.



**CONCLUSION**

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicant stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

Although no fees are believed to be due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicant



Kurt M. Pankratz  
Reg. No. 46,977

Date: June 14, 2004

**CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS**

2001 Ross Ave., Suite 600  
Dallas, TX 75201-2980  
Tel. 214.953.6477

Customer Number **05073**